

REMARKS

Claims 16 - 36 are under examination.

REJECTIONS BASED ON THE PRIOR ART

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 16-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Green* et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,517,494 (“*Green*”) in view of *Schultz*, U.S. Patent No. 5,640,553, (“*Schultz*”).

Independent Claim 16 recites:

A processing agent for processing data at a node in a data network, wherein the data network connects a plurality of nodes and at least a portion of the plurality of the nodes form a multicast group, the processing agent comprising:

a data store that is operable to store a plurality of entries associated with the multicast group, wherein each entry identifies a source that published the entry; and logic that is operable to disseminate the plurality of entries to members of the multicast group (emphasis added).

Neither *Green* nor *Schultz*, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the above claim limitations.

The Office Action interprets *Green*'s routing table as meeting the claim limitations of a data store that is operable to store a plurality of entries associated with the multicast group. However, for reasons discussed below, *Green* does not teach that entries in the routing table are disseminated to members of the multicast group. Therefore, the claim limitation of “logic that is operable to disseminate the plurality of entries to members of the multicast group” is

not met. Moreover, it would not have been obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify *Green* to arrive at the claimed invention of disseminating entries [wherein each entry identifies a source that published the entry] to members of the multicast group.

In FIG. 1, *Green* depicts several Local Area Networks (LAN) (20, 24, etc.) that include computers (70-1 – 70-N, 71-1 – 71-N, etc.). The computers are also referred to by *Green* as end points or receivers. It is these computers that form the members of a multicast group. Each LAN is coupled to the networks 15, 16 by a router (50, 53, etc.). *Green* teaches that a routing table is stored at the routers, and that the routing table is used to determine how to deliver network packets to the end nodes in a multicast group. However, *Green* does not teach that the routing table is delivered to the end nodes in the multicast group.

Moreover, there simply is NO REASON to transmit the routing table to the end nodes, as the end nodes have no use for a routing table. Moreover, transmitting routing table information to an end node could compromise network security by making information about nodes on the network available to a rogue end node. For example, if one of the computers such as 70-1 was a rogue device, providing it with routing table information might compromise network security. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not modify *Green* to have the routing table information disseminated to members of a multicast group.

Schultz does not and cannot remedy these deficiencies in *Green*. Therefore, Claim 16 is allowable.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Claim 16 is allowable.

Claims 26 and 36 contain similar limitations as those discussed in response to the rejection of Claim 16. Therefore, Claims 26 and 36 are allowable.

CLAIM 18

Claim 18 recites:

The processing agent of Claim 16, further comprising logic that is operable to add a first entry to the plurality of entries in the data store in response to a request from a first node to add the first entry.

Claim 16 recites that the entries identify a source that publish the entry. Thus, the first node that requests that the first entry be added is a source. Neither *Green* nor *Schultz*, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the above claim limitations.

Green does not teach these limitations, nor would it be obvious to modify *Green* to arrive at these limitations. *Green* teaches that a multicast distribution tree is constructed in response to requests from receivers to request that a source start transmitting (col. 6, lines 12 – 51, col. 10, lines 55-60). It is clear from *Green's* disclosure that the receiver nodes are not sources, as the receivers are those nodes in a multicast group that receive information from a source (col. 2, lines 28-31). Therefore, the multicast distribution tree is not constructed based on requests from sources to add the entries. Thus, the multicast distribution tree does not have entries *published by a source*, as claimed.

Schultz does not remedy these deficiencies, nor has the Office Action alleged that *Schultz* remedies these deficiencies in *Green*. Therefore, Claim 18 is allowable.

CLAIM 25

Claim 25 recites:

The processing agent of Claim 16, further comprising logic to indicate that the processing agent has been designated as a rendezvous node in the multicast group, wherein designation as the rendezvous node indicates that the processing agent is to disseminate the plurality of entries to members of the multicast group.

Neither *Green* nor *Schultz*, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the above claim limitations. *Green* teaches that a designated node responds to a request from an endpoint and becomes a “creator node” (col. 10, lines 41-51). As a creator node, the designated node returns a group address to the endpoint in a create group confirm packet. Thus, the designated node sends information to only the endpoint, and not to members of the multi-cast group. Further, for reasons already discussed in the response to Claim 1, *Green* does not teach any node that disseminates the plurality of entries, as claimed. Therefore, *Green* does not teach or suggest that the designated node disseminates the plurality of entries to members of the multicast group, as claimed.

Schultz does not remedy these deficiencies, nor has the Office Action alleged that *Schultz* remedies these deficiencies in *Green*. Therefore, Claim 25 is allowable.

The remaining dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on their incorporation of limitations from the Independent claims, as well as additional limitations that distinguish over cited art.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant believes that all issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed and that allowance of the pending claims is appropriate.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, the Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136.

If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: August 20, 2007

/RonaldMPomerence#43009/

Ronald M. Pomerence

Reg. No. 43,009

2055 Gateway Place, #550
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone: (408) 414-1080, ext. 210
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION VIA EFS-WEB

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)(1)(ii), I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.6(a)(4) and 1.8(a)(1)(i)(C) on the date indicated below and before 9:00 PM Pacific time.

on August 20, 2007 by /RonaldMPomerence#43009/
Ronald M. Pomerence